

I have made but not as eloquently as Thomas Friedman in his article.

He said he is now part of what he calls a "geo green movement," and he defined it as follows: The United States of America should be moving toward energy conservation and new renewable sources of energy to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

The vast majority of Americans believe that is a good thing. I certainly do. You would believe that most people in this Chamber would. But not when it comes to the actual votes on better fuel economy and better fuel efficiency for America's trucks and cars. I have tried several times unsuccessfully to pass this.

How can we honestly talk about reducing our dependence on foreign oil when we continue to drive these SUVs and trucks and cars with worse gas mileage every year? Almost 50 percent of the oil we import goes into refineries in indoor gasoline tanks. And unless or until we use less of that oil, we cannot reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

The point being made by Mr. Friedman in his article is that when America needs less foreign oil, and the price of a barrel of oil comes down, then a lot of these countries in the Middle East that supply us with oil will no longer be able to subsidize the lifestyles of monarchies and the governments of inequity. They will be forced to open and diversify their economy. Women will go to school. You will have more training of people in the workforce.

But as long as we have an inflated cost for a barrel of oil, and they are bringing millions if not billions of dollars from the United States into these Middle Eastern countries, there is no impetus or force for change in that society or lifestyle.

So Mr. Friedman challenges us in Congress and in this Government to move toward more fuel efficiency and more fuel economy, to lower the price of oil and to create another force toward democratization, toward opening the societies and governments of the Middle East. It is hard to do. It is hard to do without Government action.

My wife and I were recently looking for a new car, so we kind of laid down some rules: We wanted to buy American. We did not want an SUV. We did not need a big car like that. And we wanted something that is fuel efficient.

Well, good luck. In America, there were not many choices. We kept reading about the Ford Escape hybrid. As we read about this possibility of 35, 36 miles a gallon in the city, we went out and put in an application for one. Do you know it took 5 months to get it? Those cars are in such high demand now you cannot buy them.

So there is a market out there, and we need to encourage that market for fuel efficiency and fuel economy. It is not only good for reducing our depend-

ence on foreign oil, it is good for the environment to burn less gasoline.

I gave a speech 2 weeks ago in Chicago to a group of professional engineers and talked to them about energy and about the need for conservation. They stood up and said: We can't understand why the Senate doesn't get it. Why aren't we moving toward more fuel efficiency and more fuel economy?

Well, the honest answer is this: The Big Three in Detroit have been slow to this issue. Once again, they were scooped by the Japanese who offered hybrid automobiles long before Detroit offered them.

Why, with all of our great engineering schools, with all of the great scientists and departments of science in our major universities, do we always run a distant second when it comes to this new technology on automobiles and trucks? I do not understand it. Detroit seems to be a year behind consumer needs and appetites. I hope that changes, and changes soon.

I spoke to Dr. Bodman about this, and he reminded me it is more the province for the Department of Transportation than the Department of Energy. But when we consider an energy bill Senator DOMENICI will bring to the floor soon, look closely to see if there will be one word in there about fuel efficiency in cars and trucks. The last time there was scant reference to this challenge we face.

Well, we have to look at that from a new perspective, an honest perspective that will not only help us and our environment and lessen our dependence on foreign oil but force some changes in the countries in the Middle East which, sadly, will not change unless there is some outside force.

DARFUR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak to an unrelated issue but one which has been of great concern to me for some time and to many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle; that is, the situation in Darfur.

Last week, the United Nations Commission on Inquiry was expected to issue its report on the Darfur situation in Sudan. Public releases have now been delayed until the beginning of February.

That is unfortunate given the urgency of the crisis on the ground. It is one more delay among so many that have cost lives and delayed justice.

What media attention the Commission's report receives may focus on the question of genocide. That question revolves around whether the tens of thousands of killings, the systematic rapes, the destruction and bombing of villages, the burning of fields, and the poisoning of wells in Darfur constitutes genocide.

I believe it does. Congress has called it genocide in a resolution which we

passed on a bipartisan basis last year. President Bush has called it genocide.

The use of that word is significant. President Clinton—and I supported so many parts of his administration—made a serious mistake in foreign policy in not referring to Rwanda as a genocide. Many Americans now are seeing through the movies what happened in Rwanda. They read about it, but it was so far away. This movie "Hotel Rwanda," talks about one man who tried to save so many innocent people during the course of what was clearly a genocide. For reasons I cannot explain, the Clinton administration was reluctant to use the word.

Now comes the situation in Darfur in Sudan. And this administration, to their credit, has used the word "genocide." Why is that important? It is important because civilized countries of the world agreed, decades ago, that if a genocide should occur, we will not stand idly by. Now, why? Because we remember what happened in the holocaust in World War II.

You probably saw the references over the weekend to the anniversary celebration of Auschwitz and some of the surviving prisoners who went back, Jewish survivors who came to that same place where so many lost their lives, remembering what happened 60 years ago, and how they were finally liberated by the Russian soldiers who came to cut the barbed wire and free them. That was a genocide of the Jewish people and others.

We decided after the knowledge of that incident that we would stand as civilized nations and say: Never again. If there is a systematic attempt to kill off a people or a population, we will respond. That is why the use of the word "genocide" by Secretary of State Colin Powell, by the Congress, and by the President has such historic significance—not that we are just acknowledging the problem, but we are acknowledging a responsibility to do something about it.

Think about that. If we accept the moral responsibility of recognizing the problem, do we not have an equally great if not greater moral responsibility to do something about it?

That word, "genocide" was invented in the killing fields of the 20th century, but it certainly describes Darfur.

The use of the word matters. It carries the weight of history in a way that no other word can.

But calling it genocide by our Government has not stopped the killing in Darfur. It has not triggered a meaningful international response because words, no matter how much they matter, are not actions.

The discussion that emerges from this report should not be about words; it should be about action and what we can do to stop the killing.

A few weeks ago, Sudan reached a landmark peace agreement. You see,

this poor country was driven by two conflicts, one in the south and one in the west. Sudan reached a landmark peace agreement relative to the north-south conflict, the conflict that has racked their country for decades.

The Naivasha agreement should be celebrated. But this peace agreement does not include Darfur, a separate region that is facing its own genocidal conflict.

In the last 10 days, over 100 people have been killed and more than 9,000 were injured by Janjaweed rebels, according to the United Nations. Reports from the BBC indicate that the Sudanese Air Force may have bombed a Darfur town, killing another 100 people.

Today, there are approximately 1,400 African Union troops in Darfur, a region roughly the size of France or Iraq—1,400 peacekeepers from the African Union. They cannot stop the killing. In fact, that is not even their mission. They are supposed to be monitors of the cease-fire that has badly broken down. Their mission is just too limited, and their resources and numbers are too few.

Eleven years ago, we failed to act when the machetes came out in Rwanda. Eight hundred thousand people paid for our inaction with their lives in that African nation.

We cannot make the same mistake in Darfur. Americans understand that. When Americans were asked in a recent poll whether they thought the United Nations should step in with military force and stop the genocide in Darfur, three out of four Americans said yes. The support is bipartisan. In fact, Republicans favor intervention even more wholeheartedly than Democrats in this poll.

Almost two-thirds of those surveyed believe the United States should be willing to contribute troops to an international effort to stop the genocide.

Let me just say a word about that. As I would have the troops, 150,000, start coming home from Iraq, and it would take a small fraction of that number to create a presence in the Sudan to make a difference. President Bush demonstrated that in Liberia last year. Just the mere presence of some marines on the ground stopped the killing.

When they come to understand—these African rebels, these killers—that the United States will stand up to them, they back off. African Union troops, 1,400 of them, have not been able to convey that message. Americans believe the world should act, but they do not believe it will, according to the same polls. I hope our actions prove their pessimism wrong.

In Sudan, we have seen violence carried out by the Government, in some cases by antigovernment rebels and by the Janjaweed, the government-spon-

sored militia whose name translates roughly as “evil horsemen.”

Now, the Book of Revelations in the Bible reads as follows:

I looked, and there before me was a pale horse. Its rider was named Death, and Hades was following close behind him. They were given power over a fourth of the earth to kill by sword, famine and plague, and by the wild beasts of the earth.

That must be what it feels like to be the people of the Sudan when the Janjaweed ride in.

In the New Yorker this summer, Samantha Power, who has written so forcefully about genocide in the history of the world, and particularly in Rwanda, described a woman named Amina. This 26-year-old mother found the wells of her village stuffed with corpses. One of them might have been the body of her 10-year-old son. She is not sure. She only found his decapitated head. That is one story among 70,000 in Darfur—70,000 stories of men, women, and children who have been killed. And their numbers grow every day.

We have to help stop this. The people of Darfur have borne witness to all four horsemen of the Apocalypse—conquest, war, famine, and death.

The United States needs to forge a long-term strategy toward Sudan that helps that nation build on its north-south peace agreement. It is our responsibility, based on international law, strategic interests, and moral values.

The Convention against genocide spells out our legal obligations. Strategically, Sudan is the largest country in Africa. Its influence extends well beyond its borders. And from a moral perspective, the victims of conflict in that nation demand mechanisms for justice, peace, and reconciliation. We must be our brother's keeper.

Darfur represents a turning point for Sudan, for Africa, and, yes, for the world. If we can collectively respond, however belatedly, we set a new benchmark, not for death and destruction but for conflict resolution and accountability.

President Bush, in his inaugural address, said that our freedom in America is attached to the freedom of other peoples. Some said he went too far, that was too broad a mandate. The United States cannot, in fact, police the world. And the President answered by saying that is our aspiration, our ideal, our goal. It is not a commitment we will do in every country where freedom is being lost every day. I think that is a reasonable response from the President. But certainly in this Darfur region we understand the lack of freedom relates directly not just to tyranny but to death.

There are a series of concrete steps we ought to take. First, I believe the President should name a new special envoy for peace in Sudan. John Dan-

forth, our former Ambassador to the United Nations, showed us how important that position can be. My hope is the President will name another individual of similar stature and ability to direct our efforts.

Second, the African Union has undertaken a noble mission, but it is underfunded and undermanned. We have to work with the African Union to provide whatever logistical or technical assistance is needed to speed up this deployment.

The African Union represents the vanguard of conflict resolution on the continent of Africa. Anything we can offer to help it expand its peacekeeping capabilities will have repercussions and benefits far beyond the nation of Sudan.

Third, the people of Darfur deserve justice. It took too long for the world to pay attention, but the fact is, we have finally awakened.

If there is no accountability in Darfur, what hope is there elsewhere? Otherwise, the message we send is that one may kill, rape, and terrorize with impunity because while the world may call this genocide, it does not act.

The International Criminal Court was founded to address “the most serious crimes of concern to the international community.” What can be more serious, more heinous, than the genocide that has taken place in Darfur, that is still taking place in Darfur?

The International Criminal Court was designed just for this terrible moment, and I believe the United Nations Security Council should refer this case to the ICC.

In a recent editorial in the Washington Post, former Bush administration official Jack Smith argued that support for the ICC was inconsistent with U.S. law and administration policy. Smith wrote:

The Darfur case allows the United States to argue that Security Council referrals are the only valid route to the ICC prosecutions and that countries that are not parties to the ICC (such as the United States) remain immune from ICC control in the absence of such a referral.

An ICC referral has the advantages of speed and structure, but it is not the only path to justice. The Security Council could instead authorize the creation of an independent tribunal on human rights and crimes in Darfur as it has for Rwanda and other cases. This will cost more money, and it will probably cost time, but it is an option. What is more important is that the international community pursues accountability in one form or another.

The United States should also share its evidence of genocide with whatever body is named to seek accountability for the terrible crimes in Darfur.

President Bush spoke last week in soaring, inspiring rhetoric about liberty, freedom, and our place in the

world. But there is no liberty without basic human security. There is no freedom when armed men sweep down upon your village, raping and murdering its inhabitants. And there is no justice when the world recognizes all these terrible facts and yet does nothing.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

FREEDOM RINGS IN IRAQ

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this is a very pleasant and happy day for the Senator from New Mexico, and I hope for many Senators, Americans, and people who like freedom around the world.

I congratulate the President of the United States. He has had a very powerful commitment to freedom and democracy in Iraq. There has been discussion for many months about whether our mission in Iraq would work and about why we are there, but I think today we have seen the first giant step toward freedom for the wonderful Iraqi people who have suffered so long under tyranny and were made slaves, whose loved ones suffered, were enslaved, murdered, entombed, and killed. Thousands emigrated from that country. This is a great day for them, and I think they showed us that it was a real issue.

I am sure many did not believe these people would risk anything serious, including their lives, to have a chance at freedom. The President, by his strength of character and commitment against many odds, carried this issue forth to an electorate and an election, and has stayed with it until this great day when we saw grassroots freedom come alive.

This is an occasion when some might wonder whether we ought to have a free press over there observing things, especially in a war zone so to speak, but this is an occasion when it is obvious that it worked. Even skeptics who were there could not deny reality. The reality was that people, young and old, were not afraid of the threats of terrorism and risked everything for that little idea of exercising their franchise. We saw them putting up their inked finger indicating "I voted." I thought it was tremendous. For that, I am very proud that I supported the President in

this. I hope he is proud of what he has done.

I don't want anyone to think the Senator from New Mexico does not understand there are many pitfalls, and there may still be some that are difficult to overcome.

Ultimately, freedom and democracy are not the end. You have to have some kind of economic prosperity, stability, and law and order. I have said democracy and freedom do not work too well if you are hungry, if you are starving. That makes it pretty easy for people who would overturn freedom and democracy. The Iraqis are a fortunate people. They have a lot of resources. Let's hope they can develop them to the betterment of all their people.

There are three things I am thankful for today. The second is the U.S. military. We send our military to do much on behalf of the American people and to accomplish missions we think are important. This one I am sure many people looked at and said: They are just not going to be able to do it; this is not a role for American fighting men; they can't help with the voting; they can't get rid of the terrorists in sufficient numbers, even with sufficient intelligence and planning, to let an election move on. A lot of people thought that.

I submit that those who run the American military at the top, and those whose boots are on the ground and who run the machinery and equipment, are sending a signal: You asked us to do something. Give us some time and we will solve the problems and we will do it.

Didn't they do that and prove it yesterday? Did anybody think it could be so peaceful in so much of Iraq? There was so much opportunity for people to walk to the polls and not get killed, to see their neighbors going and then get sufficient strength and courage to join them because the terrorists were not there. There was some terrific plan, with the Iraqi soldiers who were getting trained, and ours, to create this safe haven, a significant safe haven. I surmise that a lot of hard work took place in the rooms where planning is done, in the evenings when people work, between our military leaders and the new budding leaders of the Iraqi military and Iraqi law enforcement.

I think the Iraqi police and military probably were invigorated by this event, and I would think that they, too, will be stronger and better for it.

Again, as I have on a number of occasions in my years as a Senator—it is going on 33, so I have seen a few victories—I have seen a few involvements where it was very difficult. I have seen the Vietnam war, seen the Korean war a little bit; I have seen great achievements and otherwise, but I think this is a rather significant indication of how our military will help us if we will help them.

I am so proud we did not get to the point where the naysayers in America made it impossible for the military to do their jobs. It was getting ever closer to that, but it did not get there. I think that is very fortunate for freedom, liberty, and the whole Middle East—a terribly important part of the world.

Then, lastly, I congratulate the Iraqi people. Many of those who did not like what was going on over there, many who voted for us to go in and changed their minds—there were 77 Senators who voted for us to do that, go in—to some who had just been against it turned and were accusatory of our President. Some called him a liar. Some said he had misled. That is for another day, another argument, which I have already made that I think clearly indicates those kinds of things were not true. There were no weapons of mass destruction, but that doesn't mean there were lies about it.

But some said the Iraqi people should have been dancing in the streets as our military marched through and went to Baghdad in such fast order, you recall, with very few lives lost in the American military, and very few Iraqis. But there was not laughter and joy and marching bands in the streets. But when the day finally came, when the people thought they were really rid of the tyranny of Saddam, they did. They did come forward with joy in the streets and hope in their eyes, feeling very satisfied with the job they were doing by going to vote.

So it is a very pleasant task for a Senator to come to the floor after having heard so much negative about that, even negative about our military leaders, and to say to them, to the Iraqi people, the President, to the American people who have supported this effort for freedom—we all have supported it with a lot of our tax dollars, along with our best men and women and a great deal of equipment and other things—Job well done. May the next set of actions that are required come forth and be as good as this for the people there in Iraq and the Middle East. I only hope that as we look at this and are rather pleased as Americans, that some of our normal and natural allies in the world who have become pointedly in opposition to what we have done and have carried it even further, to where people seem to think Americans are not their friends and they don't want to be our friends and we have qualities and attributes they don't like, I hope this sends a signal that maybe they ought to become more rational and reasonable about what we mean to each other. After all, we have been through a lot together—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium. We don't have to worry about the English. They have been with us all the way. We have been through a lot of sweat and blood in the name of freedom with those allies, to our cost in lives and to our cost in billions of dollars. It is not that they owe